

July 19, 2025

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Jennifer L. Rochon  
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street, Room 1920  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *Cengage Learning, Inc. et al. v. Google LLC*, No. 24:cv-04274-JLR-BCM  
Plaintiffs' Opposition to Google's Request to File a Reply

Dear Judge Rochon:

Google seeks to file a reply because it claims not to have been aware that the Plaintiffs would be prejudiced by Google's continued infringement. To say this out loud demonstrates its absurdity. Google is acutely aware of its ongoing infringement; Google receives *weekly* infringement notices from Plaintiffs. Moreover, last month Plaintiffs produced to Google a detailed list of the thousands of infringing works Google has advertised, and about which Plaintiffs have sent infringement notices, since the filing of the amended complaint. Dkt. 123 ¶ 1.

Regarding the evidence preservation issue, Google refuses to preserve important evidence unless a stay is entered. There is nothing Google can say in a reply that will make that extortionate position sound proper. Google has no excuse for its failure to preserve to date or going forward.

There is no basis for a reply.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew J. Oppenheim  
Matthew J. Oppenheim